1 Mahadhi Corzano (SBN: 254905) Krohn & Moss, Ltd. 2011 JUL 27 P 2: 11 2 10474 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 401 Los Angeles, CA 90025 3 Tel: 323-988-2400 x255 RICHARD W. WIEKING Fax: 866-583-3695 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 4 mcorzano@consumerlawcenter.com Attorneys for Plaintiff, ADR 5 **DENNIS CAMBA** 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 DENNIS CAMBA. Case No. 1-036839 Plaintiff, 10 **JURY TRIAL** 11 (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) BRACHFELD LAW GROUP, P.C., 12 Defendant. 13 14 15 **VERIFIED COMPLAINT** 16 DENNIS CAMBA (Plaintiff), by his attorneys, KROHN & MOSS, LTD., alleges the 17 following against BRACHFELD LAW GROUP, P.C., (Defendant): 18 INTRODUCTION 19 1. Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 20 U.S.C. 1692 et seq. (FDCPA). 21 2. Count II of the Plaintiff's Complaint is based on Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection 22 Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code §1788 et seq. (RFDCPA). 23 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 24 3. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692k(d), which states that such 25 actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court -1-

S1 (99)

LB

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. 1367 grants this court supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims contained therein.

- 4. Defendant conducts business in the state of California, and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
- 5. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1391(b)(2).

### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in San Jose, Santa Clara County, California.
- 7. Plaintiff is a consumer as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(3), and according to Defendant, Plaintiff allegedly owes a debt as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(5) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(h).
- 8. Defendant is a debt collector as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(6) and Cal. Civ. Code §1788.2(c), and sought to collect a consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 9. Defendant is a national company with its headquarters in Renton, Washington
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 11. Since March 2011, Defendant places collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
- 12. Defendant's representative Mr. Rodriguez calls Plaintiff at his place of employment seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
- 13. Plaintiff has told Defendant's representative Mr. Rodriguez at least three times not to call his place of employment since they do not allow personal calls.
- 14. Despite Plaintiff's notification, Defendant's representative Mr. Rodriguez continues to call Plaintiff's place of employment.

- 15. Defendant's representative Mr. Rodriguez calls Plaintiff's place of employment and leaves messages.
- 16. Defendant's representative Mr. Rodriguez calls the receptionist of Plaintiff's place of employment and asks to speak to Mr. Rodriguez.
- 17. Defendant's representative Mr. Rodriguez calls the receptionist of Plaintiff's place of employment and has him paged from their internal phone system.
- 18. Defendant calls from 866-917-1327 ext. 2316.

## COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 19. Defendant violated the FDCPA based on the following:
  - a. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(3) by repeatedly contacting Plaintiff at his place of employment even though Defendant knew that Plaintiff's employer prohibits the consumer from receiving such communications.
  - b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.
  - c. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using deceptive means in an attempt to collect a debt by calling Plaintiff at his place of employment after receiving notification that Plaintiff is not allowed to receive personal calls.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, DENNIS CAMBA, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, BRACHFELD LAW GROUP, P.C., for the following:

- 20. Statutory damages pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. 1692k,
- 21. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. 1692k
- 22. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

# COUNT II DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 23. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all of the allegations in Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint as the allegations in Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 24. Defendant violated the RFDCPA based on the following:
  - a. Defendant violated §1788.11(d) of the RFDCPA by placing collection calls to Plaintiff repeatedly and continuously so as to annoy Plaintiff.
  - b. Defendant violated §1788.17 of the RFDCPA by continuously failing to comply with the statutory regulations contained within the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, DENNIS CAMBA, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, BRACHFELD LAW GROUP, P.C., for the following:

- 25. Statutory damages pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code §1788.30(b),
- 26. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ Code § 1788.30(c), and
- 27. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

case.

DATED: July 25, 2011

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, DENNIS CAMBA, demands a jury trial in this

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KROHN & MOSS, LTD.

By:

Mahadhi Corzand Attorney for Plaintiff

1 2 3 4 5 VERIFICATION OF COMPLAINT AND CERTIFICATION 6 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 Plaintiff, DENNIS CAMBA, states as follows: 8 I am the Plaintiff in this civil proceeding. 1. I have read the above-entitled civil Complaint prepared by my attorneys and I believe 2. that all of the facts contained in it are true, to the best of my knowledge, information 9 and belief formed after reasonable inquiry. 10 3. I believe that this civil Complaint is well grounded in fact and warranted by existing law or by a good faith argument for the extension, modification or reversal of existing 11 law. 4. I believe that this civil Complaint is not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass any Defendant(s), cause unnecessary delay to any Defendant(s), or create a . 12 needless increase in the cost of litigation to any Defendant(s), named in the 13 Complaint. I have filed this Complaint in good faith and solely for the purposes set forth in it. 5. 14 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746(2), I, DENNIS CAMBA, hereby declare (or certify, 15 verify or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 -6-